UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,756	12/15/2005	Takatoshi Tsujimura	JP920010371US1	4741
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION DEPT. 18G BLDG. 321-482 2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533			EXAMINER	
			ARENA, ANDREW OWENS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EFIPLAW@US.IBM.COM

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/528,756	TSUJIMURA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Andrew O. Arena	2811				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISTRICT IN THE MAILING DEPLY WITH THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 A</u>	April 2009					
•		s action is non-final.					
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
- 4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-7,9 and 10</u> is/are pending in the	e application					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10</u> is/are rejected.						
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
	on Papers						
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/528,756 Page 2

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

The arguments filed 04/07/2009 have been fully considered, those regarding rejections based solely on Yu are persuasive but moot in view of the new grounds of rejection, those regarding the combination of Akai and Yu are not persuasive.

In particular, Yu does not disclose a portion of the organic layer directly underneath the trench wall.

The arguments that "there would not be any reasonable probability of success" (pg 6 ¶3) are not convincing. The combination of references provides all the knowledge and guidance necessary. It is clear that the walls of Yu are adequate for the liquid doping performed by Yu. If there were any worry about the trench wall pattern in Akai, it is alleviated in using the method of Yu to dope Akai since one could just use the trench wall pattern material of Yu, or any other known suitable material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Statute 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is the basis for obviousness rejections made herein:

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Akai (JP 2001-210469) and Yu (US 7,098,060).

RE claim 1, Yu discloses an organic light emitting diode device (col 1 In 11-14), comprising (e.g., Fig 1E):

a substrate (10; col 4 ln 46);

a first electrode (20; col 4 In 47) formed on the substrate;

an organic electroluminescent function layer (50, 56, 58; col 5 In 5 & In 20-24) formed on the substrate;

Page 3

a trench wall pattern (30; col 4 ln 47) formed adjacently to the function layer; and a second electrode layer (60; col 5 ln 25) formed on the function layer and the trench wall pattern,

wherein a doping concentration in the function layer (56, 58) under (not above) a wall (30 between 56 and 58) forming the trench pattern is lower than in other portions of the function layer (50 is doped less than 56 and 58, col 5 ln 1-24).

Yu differs from the claimed invention only in not disclosing a portion of the function layer resides directly underneath said trench wall.

Akai is analogously directed to an organic light emitting diode and teaches a trench wall pattern (111 in ¶55, which began as 110 in ¶42) forming a pattern on a function layer (106, ¶36), such that a portion of the function layer resides directly underneath said trench wall.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made (i) said trench wall forms a pattern on said function layer, and (ii) a portion of the function layer resides directly underneath said trench wall; and; at least to use a known suitable arrangement, e.g., to ease manufacture in that etching of the function layers would not be necessary.

RE claim 2, Yu discloses the function layer (50, 56, 58) contains one of polymer and oligomer, each having an amine derivative structure (col 8 lns 11, 16 & 36).

Application/Control Number: 10/528,756

Art Unit: 2811

RE claim 3, Yu as modified discloses different types of dopant are contained in areas of the function layer (col 5 In 5 & In 20-24), the areas (50, 56, 58) being adjacent to each other while being spaced said trench wall (30).

Page 4

RE claim 5, Akai discloses a method for manufacturing an organic light emitting diode device (¶8), the method (¶30) comprising the steps of:

forming (Drawing 1, ¶31, ¶35) a first electrode (102) on a substrate (101); forming (Drawing 2) an organic electroluminescent function layer (106, ¶36) on the electrode;

forming (Drawing 3-5) a trench pattern (111 in ¶55, which began as 110 in ¶42) on said organic electroluminescent function layer; and

forming (Drawing 6) a second electrode layer (112, ¶56) on the function layer and the trench pattern.

Akai differs from the claimed invention only in not disclosing performing doping of the function layer.

Akai's above-cited method creates a monochrome display (¶29, ¶59). Akai also contemplates a full color display (¶38) but does not give manufacturing details.

Yu is analogously directed to a method for manufacturing an organic light emitting diode device displaying full-color images (col 1 ln 10-13). Yu discloses forming an organic electroluminescent function layer (50) including a trench pattern (30) on a first electrode (20) on a substrate (10) and further discloses the step of doping (Fig 1C) the function layer by supplying a dopant solution (52, 54) along the trench pattern (col 5 lns 5, 12-16 & 20-24). Yu discloses several advantages (col 5 ln 65 - col 6 ln 65).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the method of Akai further include the step of performing doping for the function layer by supplying a dopant solution along the trench pattern; at least to use a known suitable method of achieving a full-color display.

RE claim 6, Akai discloses wherein the step of forming a trench pattern includes the steps of: forming a photoresist layer on the function layer; and patterning the photoresist layer to form the trench pattern (¶23, ¶47).

RE claim 7, combined Akai and Yu discloses a second function layer (104 or 105) having a composition different from a composition of the function layer (¶36), the second function layer being "along the trench pattern" in the completed device.

RE claim 9, Yu discloses the step of performing doping for the function layer by supplying a dopant solution includes the steps of:

supplying the dopant solution along the trench pattern (col 5 In 12-16); and dispersing the dopant into the function layer (Fig 1C-1D).

Yu differs from the claimed invention only in not explicitly disclosing the manner by which said dispersing is effected.

However, heating is one of the most well known methods of dispersing, or enhancing the dispersion of, dopants, in the art.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that said dispersing included dispersing by heating the function layer; at least to facilitate the uniform incorporation therein of the dopants.

Art Unit: 2811

RE claim 10, Yu discloses wherein the step of performing doping includes the step of supplying different types of dopant into areas of the function layer, the areas being spaced by a wall of the trench pattern (col 5 lns 5, 12-16 & 20-24).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of time extension per 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew O. Arena whose telephone number is 571-272-5976. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

Application/Control Number: 10/528,756 Page 7

Art Unit: 2811

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne A. Gurley can be reached on 571-272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more info about PAIR, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. For questions PAIR access, contact the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). For assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Rep or access to the automated info system, call 800-786-9199 or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew O. Arena/ Examiner, Art Unit 2811 30 June 2009 /Lynne A. Gurley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2811